

FEINBERG DAY KRAMER ALBERTI  
LIM TONKOVICH & BELLOLI LLP  
Robert F. Kramer (SBN 181706)  
rkramer@feinday.com  
M. Elizabeth Day (SBN 177125)  
eday@feinday.com  
David Alberti (Bar No. 220625)  
dalberti@feinday.com  
Russell S. Tonkovich (SBN 233280)  
rtonkovich@feinday.com  
Marc C. Belloli (SBN 244290)  
mbelloli@feinday.com  
Nicholas V. Martini (SBN 237687)  
nmartini@feinday.com  
Kate E. Hart (SBN 275121)  
khart@feinday.com  
Aidan M. Brewster (SBN 319691)  
abrewster@feinday.com  
577 Airport Blvd., Suite 250  
Burlingame, California 94010  
Telephone: (650) 825-4300  
Facsimile: (650) 460-8443

*Attorneys for Plaintiff*  
*Polaris PowerLED Technologies, LLC*

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

POLARIS POWERLED  
TECHNOLOGIES, LLC,

Plaintiff,

v.

VIZIO, INC.,

Defendant.

Case No. 8:18-cv-01571-JVS (DFMx)

**PLAINTIFF POLARIS  
POWERLED TECHNOLOGIES,  
LLC'S RESPONSIVE  
SUPPLEMENTAL CLAIM  
CONSTRUCTION BRIEF**

Judge: Hon. James v. Selna

1 VIZIO argues that “configured to receive” should be given its plain and  
2 ordinary meaning of “designed to receive” in the phrases “a first input configured to  
3 receive a user signal” in claim 1 and “a second input configured to receive a  
4 selection signal” in claim 9. ECF 236 at 1. VIZIO’s “designed to receive”  
5 construction is completely new to Polaris as VIZIO never informed or discussed this  
6 construction with Polaris at any point prior to the VIZIO filing its supplemental  
7 brief.

8 Since the claim construction hearing on November 20, VIZIO has changed its  
9 position with regard to these two terms. VIZIO presents absolutely no argument  
10 restricting how the “first input” and “second input” can be implemented. In VIZIO’s  
11 supplemental brief, VIZIO does *not* dispute that “a first input configured to receive a  
12 user signal” and “a second input configured to receive a selection signal” can be  
13 implemented in hardware, software, or a combination of both. In fact, VIZIO  
14 proposes a broad, plain meaning construction of “configured to receive” as  
15 “designed to receive,” which would necessarily cover all implementations “designed  
16 to receive” a signal regardless of whether the implementations are in hardware,  
17 software, or a combination of both.

18 Furthermore, the claim language is directed to a “brightness control circuit”  
19 with “a first input *configured to* receive a user signal” and “a second input  
20 *configured to* receive a selection signal.” The only way to *configure* the “input” of a  
21 circuit is in hardware, software, or a combination of both. Polaris’ construction thus  
22 accurately states the meaning of configured to in the context of the claims.

23 Therefore, in light of VIZIO’s supplemental brief, there appears to be no  
24 dispute between the parties that “a first input configured to receive a user signal” and  
25 “a second input configured to receive a selection signal” can be implemented in  
26 hardware, software, or a combination of both. The Court should thus adopt Polaris’  
27 constructions of “a first input configured to receive a user signal” as “a first input  
28 actually programmed or implemented with hardware or software to receive a user

1 signal” in claim 1 and “a second input configured to receive a selection signal” as “a  
2 second input actually programmed or implemented in hardware or software to  
3 receive a selection signal” in claim 9.

4  
5 Dated: December 16, 2019

FEINBERG DAY KRAMER ALBERTI  
TONKOVICH LIM & BELLOLI LLP

6  
7  
8 By: /s/ Robert F. Kramer  
Robert F. Kramer

9  
10 *Attorneys for Plaintiff*  
Polaris PowerLED Technologies, LLC